

DESIGN BUILD

303 - I-90 ROCKFALL MITIGATION - W OF DREXEL

-1-

The Montana Department of Transportation is soliciting construction and design services for the

I-90 ROCKFALL MITIGATION - W OF DREXEL - CALL 303 Design-Build project.

I-90 ROCKFALL MITIGATION - W OF DREXEL RFQ & ATTACHMENTS

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

RFQ Advertisement	April 25, 2013
SOQ Response Due	May 20, 2013 by 11:00 am
Short List	May 28, 2013
RFP Issue	May 29, 2013
Technical Proposal Due	July 3, 2013 by 11:00 am
Online Q&A Forum Closes	July 15, 2013 by 10:00 am
Bid Price Proposal Due	July 18, 2013 by 11:00 am
Final Selection	July 23, 2013
Award Date	July 23, 2013
Notice to Proceed	July 30, 2013

-2-

Submitted: Wed, 29-May-2013 11:15 MDT

The Ranked Short List for this project is listed below:

1

Hi-Tech Rockfall Construction
Shannon & Wilson
HDR Engineering

2

GeoStabilization International

3

Schellinger Const.

Tetra Tech
Morrison Maierle Inc.
Rock & Co.

-3-

Clarification:

Submitted: Wed, 05-Jun-2013 9:30 MDT

The survey files referenced in the RFP are available at the following link:

SURVEY FILES

-4-

Clarification:

Submitted: Fri, 14-Jun-2013 16:06 MDT

The pre-proposal meeting minutes can be found at the following link:

PRE-PROPOSAL MEETING MINUTES

-5-

Clarification:

Submitted: Tue, 09-Jul-2013 11:30 MDT

The Bid Price Proposal due date is being delayed in order to pursue additional right of way for the slide at MP 24.1.

Do not submit your Bid Price Proposal on July 18. If additional right of way can be obtained, MDT will be issuing an addendum to the RFP and requesting a revised design for this site from the Short Listed DB Firms. It is anticipated the DB Firms will be notified of the addendum and revised dates within two weeks. The schedule will be adjusted to accommodate this delay. We apologize for any inconvenience.

-6-

Clarification:

Submitted: Wed, 17-Jul-2013 13:50 MDT

The Right of Way negotiations were unsuccessful; therefore, no addendum is being issued for this project. MDT is moving forward with the Firms Technical Proposal designs and each will be scored with the information currently in the Technical Proposal. Due to this delay, the Firms Contract Time included in Criteria #2 will not be used. The Firms will establish the Contract Time in the Bid Price Proposal.

Additional contract time will be added and a winter shutdown period will be identified in the Q&A in Question 10.

The Bid Price Proposal Due Date is 11:00 am, July 30, 2013.

-7-

REVISED SCHEDULE OF

EVENTS

Online Q&A Forum Closes	July 26, 2013 by 10:00 am
Bid Price Proposal Due	July 30, 2013 by 11:00 am
Final Selection	July 30, 2013
Award Date	August 6, 2013
Notice to Proceed	August 13, 2013

-8-

Clarification:

Submitted: Mon, 22-Jul-2013 13:23 MDT

Linked is the RFP and attachments: [RFP & ATTACHMENTS](#)

-9-

FIRM	FIRMS TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORE	TECHNICAL PROPOSAL AWARDED POINTS	FIRMS TOTAL COST	COST PROPOSAL TOTAL AWARDED POINTS	TOTAL POINTS
Hi-Tech Rockfall	58,995	55.31	Non-responsive	0.0	Non- responsive*
Geostabilization International	58,560	54.90	Non-responsive	0.0	Non- responsive**
Schellinger Construction	53,430	50.09	\$ 3,025,000.00	25.00	75.09

* The Hi Tech Rockfall Bid Price Proposal was non-responsive for two reasons:
1) the proposed completion date was during the winter shutdown period
identified in the Q&A and
2) the required DBE Schedule of Participation was not included with their bid
price proposal.

** The GeoStabilization International Bid Price Proposal was non-responsive
because the required
DBE Schedule of Participation was not included with their bid price proposal.

-1-

Submitted: Wed, 08-May-2013 10:42 MDT

Company: Morrison-Maierle

Contact: John Pavsek

Question:

1) The RFQ references SUE requirement and the Team's responsibility to
relocate or adjust utilities impacted by the
project design. Does the Department have utility mapping in the area of the
slides and is this information available

for us to assess the level work? Is the D-B Team responsible for any utility company costs to relocate/protect their facility?

2) Regarding the schedule - 80 days appears to be insufficient to complete the design, permitting, MDT approval, and construction. Will the Department consider an extension?

3) The standard 90% and final review submittal process chews up a large portion of the design phase time. For the less complex component design elements (i.e., traffic control, crossover design), would the Department consider waiving the 90% submittal and allow us to go straight to final?

4) Regarding liability associated with the rock fall mitigation design and construction, we assume that the standard liability provisions apply to this D-B project as is typically exercised for standard D-B-B projects. Will MDT accept long term liability for future slope performance and mitigation measures upon completion of construction of the slope mitigation by the design build team in accordance with the approved final project plans and specifications?

5) The Project Split Report references a consultant prepared "Preliminary Site Assessment" of the slide area dated February 25, 2013. Is this report available for review?

Answer:

Submitted: Fri, 10-May-2013 11:30 MDT

1) MDT does not have any utility mapping in the area of the slides. There are no permits for any utility facilities in the I-90 Right-Of-Way from RP 24.04 to RP 24.19 or from RP 24.59 to RP 24.72. The successful Firm is responsible for all utility relocation and protection costs impacted by the project design.

2) Yes. The Contract Time may not exceed 90 days.

3) MDT will waive the 90% plan review requirement for the traffic control plan and the crossover design. All other component plan reviews still require 90% and 100% submittals. The Firm's schedule will allow 7 calendar days for MDT review time for each design component submittal rather than the standard 14 calendar days.

4) MDT accepts long term liability for future slope performance.

5) The Preliminary Site Assessment can be found at this link: [PRELIMINARY SITE ASSESMENT](#)

-2-

Submitted: Tue, 14-May-2013 08:17 MDT

Company: Morrison-Maierle, Inc.

Contact: John Pavsek

Question:

Based on our interpretation of the 1st paragraph in the Project Description of the RFQ, is the MDT's goal to provide slope stabilizations systems such as draped rockfall protection or nailed Tecco systems "in addition to" a passive rockfall fencing along the interstate?

We've carefully considered the scope of the work, and considering the manpower requirements, and the potential for weather delays feel that 90 days is inadequate to process geotech system designs, clean the slopes, and responsibly construct both active and passive measures.

Would MDT allow the contractor to perform slope stabilization and interchange protection measures in the fall (i.e., within the 90-calendar days) and return in the spring to perform the balance of the slope stabilization construction (geotech system)?

Answer:

Submitted: Thu, 16-May-2013 9:23 MDT

The project goal is to mitigate two unstable rock slopes adjacent to Interstate 90. It is the responsibility of the Design Build Firm to design and construct rockfall mitigation measures in order to meet this goal in the timeframe specified. The measures listed in the RFQ are example options, not required measures. Partial completion of mitigation measures with a subsequent construction phase to finish the project the following year is not acceptable.

-3-

Submitted: Fri, 17-May-2013 08:53 MDT

Company: Tetra Tech

Contact: Brandy Moses Straub, Marketing Support

Question:

Are resumes included as part of the page count in this 50-page SOQ submittal?

Answer:

Submitted: Fri, 17-May-2013 10:05 MDT

Yes.

-4-

Submitted: Thu, 06-Jun-2013 12:53 MDT

Company: Schellinger Construction Co., Inc.

Contact: Mark Cyr

Question:

Did MDT complete a NEPA/MEPA review as indicated in the SOQ? If so, please provide a copy as indicated. If no MEPA review has been completed, what level of analysis will be required (documentation of applicability for a categorical exclusion or EA)?

Answer:

Submitted: Fri, 07-Jun-2013 08:14 MDT

MDT did not complete a NEPA/MEPA document. It is the Firms responsibility to prepare a draft MEPA/NEPA

Document and supporting reports for review and approval by MDT and FHWA for this project. It is up to the Firms design what level of analysis is required but it is anticipated this project will qualify as categorically excluded.

-5-

Submitted: Thu, 06-Jun-2013 12:55 MDT

Company: Schellinger Construction Co., Inc.

Contact: Mark Cyr

Question:

The Preliminary Site Assessment Report prepared by Landslide Technologies, dated February 25, 2013 references a topographic survey of the slope at MP 24.1 undertaken by the Montana Department of Transportation at the time

of the failure. Is the survey information available for review?

Answer:

Submitted: Fri, 07-Jun-2013 08:16 MDT

Only the provided survey was conducted. There is not a second survey on the other "Rock" slope at MP 24.8.

-6-

Submitted: Fri, 14-Jun-2013 09:39 MDT

Company: HI-TECH Rockfall

Contact: Chris Ingram

Question:

Knowing that a portion of the exisiting slide area at MP 24 extends above the MDT right of way are we to account for potential slide and volume of material above the right of way that may come down or only base the design on the material that exists within the MDT right of way.

Answer:

Submitted: Fri, 14-Jun-2013 15:01 MDT

The DB Firm needs to base their design on material inside and outside the right of way that has the potential to impact public safety and future maintenance. All mitigation measures must be within MDT right of way.

-7-

Submitted: Wed, 26-Jun-2013 11:30 MDT

Company: GeoStabilization International

Contact: Bryan Wavra

Question:

Can the page limit on Section 4 of the Technical Proposal be increased to 100 pages?

Answer:

Submitted: Fri, 28-Jun-2013 14:52 MDT

Yes, the page limit for Section 4 is 100 pages.

-8-

Submitted: Fri, 28-Jun-2013 16:01 MDT

Company: HI-TECH Rockfall

Contact: Chris Ingram

Question:

In the technical proposal it mentions submitting a CD are we to submit 1 CD with the proposal or 10 CD's

Answer:

Submitted: Mon, 01-Jul-2013 10:10 MDT

Only 1 CD is required.

-9-

Submitted: Wed, 03-Jul-2013 16:04 MDT

Company: Shannon & Wilson

Contact: Mark Vessely

Question:

Now that the deadline for technical proposal has passed, please indicate if any of the shortlist teams did not submit.

Answer:

Submitted: Mon, 08-Jul-2013 11:33 MDT
All 3 Firms submitted Technical Proposals.

-10-

Submitted: Tue, 16-Jul-2013 09:19 MDT
Company: HI-TECH Rockfall
Contact: Chris Ingram

Question:

Now that the project start date will be delayed it is almost certain the project can not be completed in 1 season due to winter weather. How is MDT going to handle the costs associated with demobe and then remobe in season 2?

Are we to include this cost in our proposal?

Answer:

Submitted: Wed, 17-Jul-2013 13:54 MDT

Revised Answer:

Submitted: Fri, 19-Jul-2013 15:38 MDT

The Firms should include all their mobilization in their Bid Price Proposal. Winter shutdown will be defined as all calendar days from October 19 through April 15. Obtain approval from the Project Manager to work on any No Work Days. Work on any of these days will be considered a chargeable day and assessed against the contract time unless the work is an exempt work item defined in Subsection 101.03. The Contract Time may not exceed 100 Calendar Days.

-11-

Submitted: Fri, 26-Jul-2013 14:28 MDT
Company: HI-TECH Rockfall
Contact: Chris Ingram

Question:

According to the latest update the pricing proposal is to be submitted with a contract time.

Do we need to submit a new schedule or just fill in the completion date line on the pricing proposal?

Revised Answer:

Submitted: Mon, 29-Jul-2013 10:00 MDT

The Firms only need to fill in the Completion Date on the Bid Price Proposal. The updated schedule will be required concurrent with the 100% plans submission.